

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

Amanda Houghton; Charles Douglas; and Susan  
Franklin, on behalf of themselves and all others  
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Compound DAO; Robert Leshner; Geoffrey  
Hayes; AH Capital Management, LLC; Polychain  
Alchemy, LLC; Bain Capital Ventures (GP),  
LLC; Gauntlet Networks, Inc.; Paradigm  
Operations LP,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:22-cv-07781-WHO

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT  
STATEMENT**

**Case Management Conference**

**Date: May 7, 2024**

**Time: 2:00 PM**

**Courtroom 2 (videoconference)**

**Before the Hon. William H. Orrick**

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16, and Civil Local Rule 16-10(d), the parties to the above-captioned action hereby jointly submit the following Joint Case Management Statement, reporting progress or changes since the initial Joint Case Management Statement was filed on October 24, 2023. *See* ECF No. 119.

On October 31, 2023, the Court entered the currently operative schedule for this matter (ECF No. 132):

Event	Date
Case Management Statement	April 30, 2024
Further Case Management Conference	May 7, 2024 at 2:00 p.m.
Deadline to Amend Pleadings to add Parties or Claims pursuant to FRCP 15(a)(2)	November 4, 2024
Class Certification Motion	February 10, 2025
Opposition to Class Certification	March 24, 2025
Close of Fact Discovery	April 28, 2025
Reply in Support of Class Certification	May 5, 2025
Class Certification Hearing	May 21, 2025 (time TBD)
Opening Expert Reports	May 26, 2025
Rebuttal Expert Reports	June 30, 2025
Close of Expert Discovery	August 25, 2025
Summary Judgment Motions	September 29, 2025
Summary Judgment Oppositions	November 24, 2025
Summary Judgment Replies	December 22, 2025
Dispositive Motion Hearing	February 5, 2026
Final Pretrial Conference	April 13, 2026 at 2:00 p.m.
Jury Trial	May 11, 2026 at 8:30 a.m.

Consistent with this schedule, the parties have exchanged discovery requests and engaged in three global meet and confers. On March 25, 2024, the Court entered the parties' stipulated Protective Order. ECF No. 152. The parties have agreed to a stipulated ESI protocol based on this district's model order, which they will file shortly, and are discussing search

1 methodologies for purposes of document discovery (*see* § 5). The parties continue to meet and  
 2 confer on various issues relating to certain discovery requests. There are no motions pending  
 3 before the Court.

4 **Lead Plaintiffs’ Request for Substantial Completion Deadline.** Lead Plaintiffs  
 5 propose that the Court enter a deadline of July 8, 2024, for substantial completion of document  
 6 productions in response to requests for production served as of the date of this status report. The  
 7 parties exchanged discovery requests months ago—Lead Plaintiffs served RFPs on December  
 8 14, 2023, and Defendants served RFPs between January 19, 2024 and March 3, 2024. The  
 9 parties have since met and conferred extensively on the scope of the document requests. While  
 10 Lead Plaintiffs have made two productions, consisting of 68 documents, to date, Defendants  
 11 collectively have produced *zero* documents. A deadline for the substantial completion of  
 12 productions of July 8, 2024—more than six months after Lead Plaintiffs served their discovery  
 13 requests—will ensure the parties can efficiently move on to deposition discovery and ensure  
 14 the parties exchange discovery in advance of the class certification briefing (scheduled for  
 15 February 2025) and the April 28, 2025 fact discovery deadline. Federal courts routinely compel  
 16 substantial completion of document productions by a date certain, in accordance with Rule  
 17 34(b)(2)(B)’s requirement to specify a “reasonable time” for production, notwithstanding  
 18 ongoing negotiations over search terms or discovery disputes. *See, e.g., Tyler v. City of San*  
 19 *Diego*, No. 14-cv-01179-GPC-JLB, 2015 WL 1955049, at \*2–3 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 29, 2015)  
 20 (granting motion to compel production of responsive ESI by a date certain). Defendants’  
 21 contention that it is premature for the Court to set a substantial completion deadline—more than  
 22 four months after the RFPs were served—is meritless.

23  
 24 **Defendants’ Response: Lead Plaintiffs’ Request for a Substantial Completion**  
 25 **Deadline of July 8, 2024 Is Premature, Unnecessary, and Unrealistic.**

26 Plaintiffs sought an 18-month fact discovery schedule—over Defendants’ objections and  
 27 request for a shorter schedule—in which fact discovery will not end until April 28, 2025. *See* ECF  
 28 No. 119, at 7. Plaintiffs have since propounded 90 document requests on each Defendant. In  
 response to those broad discovery requests, the parties have been engaged in global meet and

1 confer sessions with the understanding that the parties would continue to negotiate in good faith  
2 to (hopefully) resolve their disputes regarding the scope of Plaintiffs' requests, after which the  
3 parties would negotiate search terms for Defendants to run across relevant custodians, as  
4 contemplated in the parties' stipulated ESI Protocol. That meet-and-confer process is ongoing,  
5 and the ball has been in Plaintiff's court for nearly a month following an April 2, 2024 meeting.  
6 Plaintiffs now ask the Court to impose an arbitrary deadline of July 8, 2024—ten months before  
7 the end of fact discovery—for Defendants to substantially complete their document productions.  
8 The Court should deny Plaintiffs' request for at least three reasons.

9 *First*, it is premature to set a substantial completion deadline. The parties have just reached  
10 an agreement on the ESI protocol, are still meeting and conferring over Plaintiffs' requests, and  
11 have not yet begun to negotiate search terms as required under the stipulated ESI Protocol. Once  
12 the parties have agreed on scope of discovery and search terms, there will be more clarity as to the  
13 total number of potentially responsive documents and the time required to complete the review.

14 *Second*, the prematurity of Plaintiffs' requests is underscored by the fact that there is nearly  
15 a year remaining in the fact discovery period. Plaintiffs provide no legitimate reason why  
16 document production has to be substantially complete nearly 10 months before the end of fact  
17 discovery on April 28, 2025, a date that Plaintiffs chose. Plaintiffs point to the deadline for class  
18 certification, but that will not occur until February 2025, and Plaintiffs have not identified what  
19 discovery they need from Defendants related to class certification. Defendants have also agreed  
20 to make their first productions within the next few weeks while the parties continue to meet and  
21 confer. Thus, any purported concern by Plaintiffs about potential discovery delay by Defendants  
22 is pretextual and belied by the parties' communications.

23 *Third*, while the Parties have not yet negotiated search terms, Defendants anticipate that  
24 they will each need to review a substantial number of documents based on the breadth of Plaintiffs'  
25 90 initial requests for production. Given the anticipated volume and the lack of agreement on the  
26 scope of review, Defendants expect that it will be unduly burdensome, and potentially unrealistic  
27 to complete their review and production by July 8, 2024.

28 Rather than seeking an arbitrary, unnecessary and impractical deadline, Defendants  
respectfully submit that the parties should continue to meet and confer in order to hopefully resolve  
their outstanding issues or at least narrow them, and to agree on a mutually-agreeable substantial  
completion deadline. If the parties are unable to do so within 30 days of the CMC, the parties can  
seek relief from this Court as necessary.

No settlement discussions have taken place. The Parties have discussed the possibility of settlement discussions and are in compliance with ADR L.R. 3-5, but believe that such settlement discussions are premature at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 04/30/2024

**LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**

By: /s/ Morgan E. Whitworth  
 Matthew Rawlinson (SBN 231890)  
 matt.rawlinson@lw.com  
 140 Scott Drive  
 Menlo Park, CA 94025  
 Tel: +1 (650) 328-4600

Morgan E. Whitworth (SBN 304907)  
 morgan.whitworth@lw.com  
 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
 San Francisco, CA 94111

Douglas K. Yatter (SBN 236089)  
 douglas.yatter@lw.com  
 Benjamin Naftalis (Admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 benjamin.naftalis@lw.com  
 1271 Avenue of the Americas  
 New York, NY 10020  
 Tel: +1 (212) 906-1200

Susan E. Engel (Admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 susan.engel@lw.com  
 555 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 1000  
 Washington, D. C. 20004  
 Tel: +1 (212) 637-2200

*Attorneys for AH Capital Management, L.L.C.*

Dated: 04/30/2024

**CLEARY GOTTlieb STEEN & HAMILTON LLP**

By: /s/ Jared Gerber  
 Jennifer Kennedy Park (SBN 344888)  
 jkpark@cgsh.com  
 1841 Page Mill Rd Suite 250  
 Palo Alto, CA 94304

Roger A. Cooper (Admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 racooper@cgsh.com  
 Jared Gerber (Admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 jgerber@cgsh.com  
 Samuel Levander (Admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 slevander@cgsh.com  
 One Liberty Plaza

New York, NY 10006

*Attorneys for Defendant  
Polychain Alchemy, LLC*

Dated: 04/30/2024

**SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP**

By: /s/ Zachary M. Faigen  
Peter B. Morrison (SBN 230148)  
peter.morrison@skadden.com  
Zachary M. Faigen (SBN 294716)  
zack.faigen@skadden.com  
300 South Grand Avenue, Suite 3400  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: (213) 687-5000

Alexander C. Drylewski (Admitted *pro hac vice*)  
alexander.drylewski@skadden.com  
One Manhattan West  
New York, NY 10001  
Telephone: (212) 735-3000

*Attorneys for Defendant Paradigm Operations LP*

Dated: 04/30/2024

**JENNER & BLOCK LLP**

By: /s/ Kayvan B. Sadeghi  
H. An N. Tran (SBN 267685)  
ATran@Jenner.com  
Benjamin T. Hand (SBN 330451)  
bhand@jenner.com  
Benjamin T. Halbig (Cal. Bar No. 321523)  
bhalbig@jenner.com  
455 Market Street Suite 2100  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2453  
Telephone: +1 628 267 6800

Kayvan B. Sadeghi (Admitted *pro hac vice*)  
ksadeghi@jenner.com  
1155 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036-2711  
Telephone: +1 212 891 1600

*Attorneys for Defendant Bain Capital Ventures (GP), LLC*

Dated: 04/30/2024

**MORRISON COHEN LLP**

By: /s/ Michael Mix  
Jason Gottlieb (Admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Edward P. Gilbert (Admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Michael Mix (Admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Vani Upadhyaya (Admitted *pro hac vice*)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

909 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10022  
(212) 735-8600

*Attorneys for Defendants  
Robert Leshner, Geoffrey Hayes,  
and Gauntlet Networks, Inc*

Dated: 04/30/2024

**GERSTEIN HARROW LLP  
FAIRMARK PARTNERS, LLP  
SUSMAN GODFREY, L.L.P.**

By: /s/ Rohit D. Nath  
Jason Harrow (Cal. Bar No. 308560)  
3243B S. La Cienega Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90016  
jason@gerstein-harrow.com  
(323) 744-5293(323) 744-5293

Charles Gerstein (*pro hac vice*)  
Emily Gerrick (*pro hac vice*)  
810 7th Street NE, Suite 301  
Washington, DC 20002  
charlie@gerstein-harrow.com  
(202) 670-4809

James Crooks (*pro hac vice*)  
Michael Lieberman (*pro hac vice*)  
FAIRMARK PARTNERS, LLP  
1499 Massachusetts Ave. NW, #113A  
Washington, DC 20005  
jamie@fairmarklaw.com  
(619) 507-4182

Steven G. Sklaver (237612)  
ssklaver@susmangodfrey.com  
Oleg Elkhunovich (269238)  
oelkhunovich@susmangodfrey.com  
Rohit D. Nath (316062)  
rnath@susmangodfrey.com  
Nicholas N. Spear (304281)  
nspear@susmangodfrey.com  
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
Los Angeles, California 90067-6029  
Telephone: (310) 789-3100  
Facsimile: (310) 789-3150

Taylor H. Wilson (*pro hac vice*)  
twilson@susmangodfrey.com  
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
1000 Louisiana St., Suite 5100  
Houston, TX 77002  
Telephone: (713) 651-9366

Facsimile: (713) 654-6666

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

**ATTESTATION**

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3) regarding signatures, I attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from the other signatories.

Dated: April 30, 2024

By: /s/ Rohit D. Nath  
Rohit D. Nath